



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/531,102	03/17/2000	Robert Giannini	JARB.004PA	5258

7590 12/18/2002
Crawford PLLC
1270 Northland Drive
Suite 390
St. Paul, MN 55120

EXAMINER	
WASYLCHAK, STEVEN R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8K

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/531,102	GIANNINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven R. Wasylchak	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/29/02.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Remarks

1. Claims 1-16 are pending.
2. Claims 1-3 and 7-11 were amended; claims 13-16 were added.
3. In response to Applicant's arguments, a detailed breakdown of reference locations of operative terms in the claims is provided in parenthesis and 35 USC 102 has been dropped.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Kagami et al (US 5,974,400) and further in view of Graf et al (US 6,349,300).

As per claim 1,

(Amended) A system for on-line viewing of an article on another structure, comprising:

-on-line viewer site; / fig 2(203); abstract; col 2, L 12-20; col 11, L 7-10

-and a computer-driven web-linking engine configured and arranged to create an item from image-data/ col 1, L 10-19; fig 5(501); fig 7; fig 8, col 3, L 17-18; col 3, L 56-66.

-corresponding to a colored article selected by an on-line viewer from the on-line viewer site for display with an image of a colored structure selected by the on-line viewer,/ fig 7(701,702,705); fig 8(705,801,20131).

-Kagami teaches the computer-driven web-linking engine and the colored article and the colored structure./ fig 8 (801: TRY ON RESULTS, which would include color combinations). However, Kagami does not explicitly teach comparison of color codes identifying respective colors. Graf et al teaches the comparison of color codes identifying respective colors. / abstract; fig 2 (34,48); fig 3; fig 5(30,54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine these limitations for the advantage of simultaneous multiple comparisons to save time and, In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669,124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), the court held that plurality or parts or elements has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced, of which Examiner sees no unexpected result (in response to Applicant's argument of "viewing the color of more than one item at a time on line").

-Kagami teaches a colored article and the colored structure/ fig 8 (801: TRY ON RESULTS, which would include color combinations). However, Kagami et al does not explicitly teach the colored article and the colored structure satisfying a color-matching scheme. Graf et al teaches the color matching scheme (abstract; fig 2,3,5); col 1, L 4-63; col 3, L 59 to col 4, L 34; col 5, L 5-31, L 65 to col 6, L 29.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine these limitations for the advantage of simultaneous multiple comparisons to save time and, In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669,124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), the court held that plurality or parts or elements has no patentable

significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced, of which Examiner sees no unexpected result (in response to Applicant's argument of "viewing the color of more than one item at a time on line").

As per claim 2,

(Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein the computer-driven web-linking engine compares by using a data set that includes a frequency-based color identification code provided for the color of the article and a frequency-based color identification code provided for the color of the structure. / col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52

As per claim 5,

The system of claim 1, further including a computer arrangement generating the image data corresponding to the colored article with the color identification code provided for the color of the article. / col 4, L 17-58; col 5, L 38-64

As per claim 6,

A system for on-line viewing of an article on another structure, comprising:
-means for viewing images at a video display site; and
web-linking means for creating an item from image-data corresponding to a colored article selected by an on-line viewer from the on-line viewer site with an image of a colored structure selected by the on-line viewer, the computer-driven web-linking engine adapted to indicate whether the colored article and the colored structure satisfy a color-matching criterion. / refer to reasoning under claim 1

As per claim 7,

(Amended) A method for on-line viewing of an article on another structure, comprising: viewing images at a video display site; and creating an item from image-data corresponding to a colored article selected by an on-line viewer from the on-line viewer site for display with an image of a colored structure selected by the on-line viewer, comparing color codes identifying respective colors of the colored article and colored item, and in response, indicating whether the colored article and the colored structure satisfy a color-matching criterion. / refer to reasoning under claim 1

As per claim 8,

(Amended) A method for on-line viewing of an article on an other structure, comprising: creating an item from image-data corresponding to a colored article selected by an on-line viewer from an on-line viewer site for display with an image of a colored structure selected by an on-line viewer, comparing color codes identifying respective colors of the colored article and colored item, and in response, indicating whether the colored article and the colored structure satisfy a color-matching criterion. / refer to reasoning under claim 1

As per claim 9,

(Amended) The method of claim 8, further including creating the item using a data set that includes a frequency-based color identification code provided for the color of the article and a frequency-based color identification code provided for the color of the structure. / col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52

Art Unit: 3624

As per claim 12,

The method of claim 8, further including generating the image-data corresponding to the colored article with the color identification code provided for the color of the article. / col 4, L 17-58; col 5, L 38-64

As per claim 13,

(New) The system of claim 1, wherein the color-matching criterion includes a color reference coding chart. / abstract; fig 1-5; col 1, L 4-63; col 3, L 59 to col 4, L 34; col 5, L 5-31, L 65 to col 6, L 29

As per claim 14,

(New) The system of claim 14, wherein the color-reference coding chart is based on measured color frequencies. / col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52 (spectrum as a range of frequencies which are a property of all colors)

As per claim 15,

(New) The system of claim 15, wherein respective colors of the colored article and the colored structure are represented by an electronic color tag that indicates a measurement of the respective colors using the color-reference chart. / col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52

As per claim 16,

(New) The system of claim 16, wherein the electronic tags are part of product codes that identify the respective article and structure. / col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52

Art Unit: 3624

6. Claims 3, 4 and 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graf et al (US 6,349,300) and in view of Kagami et al. (US 5,974,400).

As per claims 3 and 10,

The system of claim 2, wherein Graf teaches a data set (col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52).

However, Graf does not teach an article size code. Kagami et al teaches an article size code (col 70, L 41-50; fig 27(identifier as a code); fig 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this limitation for the advantage of offering more product information upon which a customer can make a more informed decision to purchase an article.

As per claim 4 and 11,

The system of claim 3, wherein Graf teaches a the data set (col 5, L 65 to col 6, L 52).

However, Graf does not teach an article style code. Kagami et al teaches an article style code (col 34, L 66 to col 35, L 17; col 50, L 53-62 (style is a preference); col 63, L 15-19; col 96, L 62-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this limitation for the advantage of offering more product information upon which a customer can make a more informed decision to purchase an article.


This action is FINAL. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven R. Wasylchak whose telephone number is (703) 308-2848. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. EST.

Art Unit: 3624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin, can be reached at (703) 308-1065. The fax number for Art Unit 3624 is (703) 305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Steven Wasylchak


12/6/02

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600


VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600